

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration of the subject application is requested. The specification has been editorially amended to properly refer to the parent application. Claims 1-9 remain in the application. Claim 6 has been amended.

In Section 1 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, the Examiner notes that the application should be referred to as a continuation application of Application Serial No. 09/133,636 (sic) [Note that the correct Serial No. of the parent application is 09/153,636]. This comment has been addressed through the editorial amendment of the specification.

In Section 3 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, claims 1-9 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1, 2, 8, 9, and 11-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,317,470. This rejection is traversed through the enclosed Terminal Disclaimer.

In Section 4 of the Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, claim 6 has been objected to because of an informality. This objection has been addressed through the editorial changes to claim 6.

All claims in the application are believed to be in allowable form. Allowance of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

*Robert P. Lenart*

Robert P. Lenart  
Reg. No. 30,654  
Pietragallo, Bosick & Gordon  
One Oxford Centre, 38<sup>th</sup> Floor  
301 Grant Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
Telephone: 412-263-4399  
Facsimile: 412-261-0915  
Attorney for Applicants